



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,223	12/21/2004	Georg Gros	DNAG-293	2138
24972	7590	05/28/2008		
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP			EXAMINER	
666 FIFTH AVE			VDAYAKUMAR, KALLAMBELLA M	
NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/511,223

Applicant(s)

GROS, GEORG

Examiner

KALLAMBELLA VIJAYAKUMAR

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 104-140 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 104-140 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 128-129 and 137-138 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/10/2008 has been entered.
- Claims 104, 108-112, 124, 129, 132-133, 137 were amended. Claims 104-140 as amended are currently pending with the application.
- Applicant's arguments with respect to claims filed 03/10/2008 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

- Claims 128-129 and 137-138 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The claims 128-129 do not further limit the process of coating in claim-117. Claims 137-138 does not further limit the particle size distribution in claim 134.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 104 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim

Art Unit: 1793

recites the limitation of "substantially free of chromium" that is not disclosed in the specification, and the specification discloses "free of chromium" (Para-0090; Claim-60: Spec: US 2005/0161641).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 104, 119, and 121-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- Claim-104 recites a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 104 recites the broad recitation 0.5-70 wt% of A in Line 19, and the claim also recites 4.5-70 wt% in Line-12 which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.
- Claim-104 recites the limitation in an improper Markush group in Lines 2-3 and it is suggested to rewrite in a proper format (i.e. selected from a group consisting of a, b, and c).
- Claims 119, and 121-122 recite the limitation of "the electrically conductive or semiconducting hard particles a)" and there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
1. Claims 104-117, 119-134, and 136-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Leon et al (US 3,562,124) in view of either Tsuneta (US 5,213,846) or Matsuda et al (US 3,904,555) .

The examiner makes of record that instant claim 104 recites a broad range of components (A is from 0.5-70 wt% of the mixture) followed by a series of narrow ranges (A is present in an amount of from 4.5 to 70 wt% of the mixture). For examination purposes, the examiner asserts that the narrow ranges recited in instant claim-104 are merely exemplary ranges, and thus, the prior art will be applied against the broadest ranges recited in instant claim 104.

The examiner makes of record that in Claim-104, component-A is at least one conductive/semiconductive element or compound selected from a, b, or c, wherein the mixture comprises at least 4.5-60 wt% by weight of "a", and A is present in an amount of 4.5-70 wt% of the mixture whereby the components b, c, and d are optional components, and Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure [MPEP 2111.04 [R-3]].

Art Unit: 1793

Leon et al teach the corrosion protection coating liquid comprising an 3-50 wt% organic binder such as an epoxy (Cl-5, Ln 21-25; Cl-2, Ln 35-44) and 20-95 wt% of a filler comprising conductive metal particles such as **zinc**, **aluminum** or magnesium (Cl-2, Ln 54-59; Cl-3, Ln 17-28). 10-85 wt% of the filler contained comminuted ferro alloy such as **ferromolybdenum** and **ferrotungsten** (Cl-3, Ln 13-16; 33-36). The coating composition contained 5-60 wt% solvents, and up to 70 wt% of curing agent, and plasticizers such as castor oil or chlorinated paraffin (Cl-4, Ln 43-66). The component ratios overlap with the instant claimed ranges in the claims. The prior art further teaches the addition of magnesium montmorillonite, a silicate based additive in the coating composition (Cl-5, Ex-1, Ln 67). The particle size of the conductive fillers was 1-5 micron for the ferro alloys (Cl-3, Ln 67-70). The prior art further teaches coating a metallic substrate such as ferrous metals and forming films in the range of about 0.5-5.0 mils (Cl-5, Ln 2-8).

The prior art fails to teach the instant claimed Sn or Sn alloy per claim 104, particle sizes in claim 110, a film thickness of not more than 6 micron per claims 117, 124 or 140; or the particle size of Mg-morrillonite <silicate based pigment> per claims 134 and 137-138.

In the analogous art, Matsuda et al teach weldable/corrosion-resistant paint composition comprising one or more hard metals selected from Fe, Ni, Co, Cr, Mn and their alloys, one or more soft metals selected from Al, Zn, Pb, Cu, Cd, Mg, Ag, Sn and their alloys (Abstract, Cl-1, Ln 55-63; Cl-3, Ln 1-2), a resin such as epoxy or acrylic dispersed and a solvent (Cl-3, Ln 10-17); and coating galvanized steel plate with the composition (Cl-3, Ln 22-26) with improved electroresistance weldability inspite of low metal content and corrosion resistance (Cl-2, Ln 31-33; 42-45; Cl-3, Ln 27-28).

In the analogous art, Tsuneta et al teach corrosion-resistant paint composition comprising a binder such as epoxy, silicate such as silica, graphite and a conductive metal powder selected from Zn, Al, Mg, Fe Ni, Co, Sn, Cu, Cr, Mn or an alloy thereof (Abstract, Cl-5, Ln 1-25) and coating steel plate (Cl-6, Ln 9-11) with improved weldability (Cl-5, Ln 18-22).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to either include or substitute the conductive metal powder in the composition of Leon et al with Sn or its alloy of either Matsuda or Tsuneta et al as functional equivalent to benefit from improved corrosion-resistance/weldability with predictable results and reasonable expectation of success, because the teachings are in the analogous

Art Unit: 1793

art of weldable/corrosion-resistance coatings for metals and the species of Leon's conductive metal fillers are encompassed by the genus of conductive fillers containing Sn and its alloys.

With regard to claims 111 and 139, the prior art teaches ferrotungsten.

With regard to the particle sizes in claims 105-109, the prior art particle sizes of the ferro fillers overlap over the instant claimed ranges, and in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With regard to the particle sizes in claim-110, the prior art teaches varying the particle size wherein it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the particle size by routine experimentation, and Generally, differences in concentration or temperature or particle size will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature or particle size is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

With regard to claim-112, the prior art teaches a composition comprising epoxy binder.

With regard to claims 113, the prior art teaches ferromolybdenum.

With regard to claims 114-115, they are not essential components of the composition as shown by the lower limit of 4.5 wt% for a and A, and Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure [MPEP 2111.04 [R-3]].

With regard to claim-116, the range of not more than 1.5 wt% wax includes 0.0% and makes the component optional.

With regard to the claims 117, 124 and 140, the prior art teaches coating a metallic substrate with the composition and varying the thickness of the coated film and further suggestive that the thickness outside the typical range of 0.5 to 5.0 mil could be used depending upon the particular conditions of application and intended use, and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the coating thickness as a choice of design of intended application with reasonable expectation of success.

Art Unit: 1793

Generally, differences in concentration or temperature or thickness will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature or thickness is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In *re* Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

With regard to the process steps in claims 119, 121 and 123, the prior art teaches grinding and mixing the components forming a coating liquid, and coating a steel substrate forming a protective layer over the substrate (CI-3, Ln 72 – CI-4, Ln 41), and the examiner asserts that the prior art coating will be either same or substantially same as that produced by the claimed process steps.

With regard to claims 120 and 122, the particle size of particles being no greater than the thickness of the coating would be obvious over the coating thickness and particle size of fillers.

With regard to claims 125 and 130, the prior art does not add either organic lubricants or PTFE.

With regard to claims 126-129 and 131, the prior art teaches coating ferrous metals. Further, with regard to product by process limitation in claims 128-129, the prior art product is either same or substantially same as that claimed by the applicants and When the reference teaches a product that appears to be the same as, or an obvious variant of, the product set forth in a product-by-process claim although produced by a different process, the claim is not patentable. See *in re* Marosi, 710 F.2d 799, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983) And *in re* Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also MPEP §2113.

With regard to claims 132 and 133, the combined prior art teaches Sn and Sn alloy fillers.

With regard to claims 134 and 137-138, the prior art teaches composition containing magnesium montmorillonite, and using conductive fillers with a particle size of 1-5 micron and forming coated layers over the substrate that is as low as 12.7 micron, and the claimed upper limit of 5/6 micron for the Mg-montmorillonite would have been obvious in the prior art composition. The prior art further teaches addition of curing agents such as polyamines and polyamides (CI-4, Ln 51-56).

With regard to claim 136, the prior art component range overlaps with the instant claimed range and In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie

Art Unit: 1793

case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

2. Claims 104-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reising et al (US 6,715,916) in view of either Tsuneta (US 5,213,846) or Matsuda et al (US 3,904,555).

Reising et al teach a coating composition for weldable substrates comprising one or more conductive pigments comprising Al, Zn, **W**, **Graphite** and ferrophos (A/a) with a particle size of ~1 to ~5 microns, preferably ~ 3 micron, and in the amount of ~30 to ~60 by volume % that will meet the component ratio when calculated in terms of wt%. Graphite makes the conductive particles sliding because of its layered structure. The binder comprised of resins such as epoxy or polyurethane in the amount of ~10 to ~20 wt% (Cl-6, Ln 1-17). The composition further contained crosslinkers such as cymel and/or blocked isocyanates and a solvent and the pigment to binder ratio was ~10 to ~50 wt% (Cl-6, Ln 34-64; Cl-9, Ln 43-48) that meets the ratio limitations in claim-104 and size limitations in claims 105-109. The coating composition further contains hydrogenated or sulfated castor oil and pigments such as magnesium silicate (Cl-7, Ln 4-11). The prior art does not teach the addition of organic lubricants or PTFE that meets the limitation of claims 125 and 130. With regard to claims 134-136 and 139-140, the prior art teaches the composition containing blocked isocyanates, urea-melamine derivatives and tungsten and coating the film over a metal substrate (Cl-5, Ln 45; Cl-6, Ln 39-41; Cl-8, Ln 4-7; Cl-9, Ln 44-49).

The prior art fails to teach the instant claimed Sn or Sn alloy per claim 104, particle sizes in claim 110, and silent about the amount of castor oil derivative added per claim 116 and particle size of Magnesium silicate per claims 134 and 137-138.

In the analogous art, Matsuda et al teach weldable/corrosion-resistant paint composition comprising one or more hard metals selected from Fe, Ni, Co, Cr, Mn and their alloys, one or more soft metals selected from Al, Zn, Pb, Cu, Cd, Mg, Ag, Sn and their alloys (Abstract, Cl-1, Ln 55-63; Cl-3, Ln 1-2), a resin such as epoxy or acrylic dispersed and a solvent (Cl-3, Ln 10-17); and coating galvanized steel plate with the composition (Cl-3, Ln 22-26) with improved electroresistance weldability inspite of low metal content and corrosion resistance (Cl-2, Ln 31-33; 42-45; Cl-3, Ln 27-28).

Art Unit: 1793

In the analogous art, Tsuneta et al teach corrosion-resistant paint composition comprising a binder such as epoxy, silicate such as silica, graphite and a conductive metal powder selected from Zn, Al, Mg, Fe Ni, Co, Sn, Cu, Cr, Mn or an alloy thereof (Abstract, Cl-5, Ln 1-25) and coating steel plate (Cl-6, Ln 9-11) with improved weldability (Cl-5, Ln 18-22).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to either include or substitute the conductive metal powder in the composition of Reising et al with Sn or its alloy of either Matsuda or Tsuneta et al as functional equivalent to benefit from improved corrosion-resistance/weldability with predictable results and reasonable expectation of success, because the teachings are in the analogous art of weldable/corrosion-resistance coatings for metals and the species of Leon's conductive metal fillers are encompassed by the genus of conductive fillers containing Sn and its alloys.

With regard to claims 111 and 139, the prior art teaches tungsten.

With regard to the particle sizes in claims 105-109, the prior art particle sizes of ~1 to ~5 microns for conductive fillers that overlap over the instant claimed ranges, and in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With regard to the particle sizes in claim-110, the prior art teaches varying the particle size wherein it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to optimize the particle size by routine experimentation, and Generally, differences in concentration or temperature or particle size will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature or particle size is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

With regard to claim-112, the prior art teaches a composition comprising epoxy binder.

With regard to claim-113, the prior art teaches a composition comprising zinc molybdate (Cl-7, Ln 13-15).

Art Unit: 1793

With regard to claims 114-115, they are not essential components of the composition as shown by the lower limit of 4.5 wt% for a and A, and Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure [MPEP 2111.04 [R-3]].

With regard to claim-116, the prior art teaches the addition of castor oil derivative and any trivial amount of the component would meet the limitation of not more than 1.5 wt% ($0 \leq x \leq 1.5$, $x = \text{amt. added}$) in claim 104.

With regard to process claims 117-131 and 140, the prior art teaches forming the coating composition by milling the components (Cl-13, Ln 19-27) and applying the coating over the substrates such as steel by degreasing the substrate with a degreaser, optionally applying a pretreatment, coating the composition and curing at a temperature up to ~ 300C peak metal forming a coating with a thickness of 3-8 micron (Cl-4, Ln 22-30, 53-65, Cl-5, Ln 10-20; Cl-7, Ln 32-47; Cl-8, Ln 4-7). With regard to claims 119 and 121, the prior art teaches milling the components. With regard to claims 120 and 122, the particle size of particles being no greater than the thickness of the coating would be obvious over the film thickness and particle size of conductive fillers. With regard to claims 125 and 130, the composition is free of organic lubricants and arsenic. With regard to claims 126-129 and 131, the prior art teaches coating ferrous metals (Cl-16, Claim-16). Further, with regard to product by process limitation in claims 128-129, the prior art product is either same or substantially same as that claimed by the applicants and When the reference teaches a product that appears to be the same as, or an obvious variant of, the product set forth in a product-by-process claim although produced by a different process, the claim is not patentable. See *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983) And *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also MPEP §2113. With regard to the film thickness in claims 117, 124 and 140, the prior art thickness of 3-8 micron overlaps with the instant claimed range of not more than 6 micron and prima-facie obviousness exists.

With regard to claims 132 and 133, the combined prior art teaches Sn and Sn alloy fillers.

With regard to claims 134-135 and 137-138, the prior art teaches Mg-silicate and blocked isocyanate. With regard to the instant claimed particle size for Mg-silicate <pigment> would be obvious over the prior art film thickness of 3-8 micron.

With regard to claim 136, the prior art component range overlaps with the instant claimed range and In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In *re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In *re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 104-108, 112, 116, 134 and 136 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-35, 38, 40, 46, 47, 50, 56, 69-70 of copending Application No. 10/511242. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application and copending application are drawn to similar compositions having similar components and same utility as conductive coatings, while the instant claims contain specific ranges of components and differ from the copending claims that do not have the ranges, and it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to optimize the

Art Unit: 1793

composition for coating applications because they are well known in the art (See Wiechelhaus et al (WO 99/24545).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KALLAMBELLA VIJAYAKUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-1324. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 07-3.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 5712721358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KMV/

May 24, 2008.

/Stanley Silverman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793